

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE LT-0043 1051 10/647,135 08/25/2003 Seung Hun Yang **EXAMINER** 05/19/2005 34610 7590 FLESHNER & KIM, LLP TIBBITS, PIA FLORENCE P.O. BOX 221200 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER CHANTILLY, VA 20153 2838

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·	_11'1
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	10/647,135 ,	YANG, SEUNG HUN	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pia F. Tibbits	2838	
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP	DIVIQUET TO EVOIDE 2 M	ONTH(S) EDOM	
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a relif NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions are reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of third will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONute, cause the application to become Al	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
	nis action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	•	••	
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application	1.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a		by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyar	ice. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig	gn priority under 35 U.S.C. §	119(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:	· · ·-		
1. Certified copies of the priority docume			
2. Certified copies of the priority docume			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	•	received in this National Stage	
application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a list		rassivad	
See the attached detailed Office action for a list	st of the certified copies not	received.	
Attachment(s)	-		
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date	
Paper No(s)/Mail Date		nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 10/647,135

Art Unit: 2838

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Priority

 Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in Korea on 8/24/2002. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 10/2002/0050348 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Art Rejection Rationale

2. At the outset, the examiner notes that claims are to be given their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ 2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404, 162 USPQ 541, 550 (CCPA 1969); *In re Yamamoto*, 740 F.2d 1569, 222 USPQ 934 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Burlington Indus. V. Quigg*, 822 F.2d 1581, 3 USPQ 2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1987); *In re Morris*, 43 USPQ 2d 1753, 1756 (Fed. Cir. 1997). ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms-reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process."). In responding to this Office action, applicants are reminded of the requirements of 37 CFR 1.111 and 1.119 that applicants specifically point out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims patentable over the references in presenting responsive arguments. See MPEP 714.02. The support of any amendments made should also be specifically pointed out. See MPEP 2163.06.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Hull et al.** [hereinafter Hull][5606242] in view of **Lemke** [6880048].

The "measured battery data is damaged" was interpreted to mean that a problem exists with respect to certain memory contents of the battery, since otherwise if the battery itself was damaged it would not be clear how communication with the battery would take place.

Hull discloses in figures 1-20B restoring "smart battery" 10 data in a portable appliance/host device 16, comprising the steps of: receiving reference battery data internally set in a battery and adapted to manage the battery, and storing the received reference battery data as backup data; comparing battery data periodically measured for the battery with the stored reference battery data[see the abstract; fig.6A; column 1, lines 20-33; column 17, lies 40-67]. Hull does not disclose updating the reference battery data set in the battery by the stored reference battery data when it is determined in accordance with the comparison that the measured battery data is damaged.

Lemke discloses that once a flash ROM is loaded with incorrect or corrupted data, the device is rendered inoperable, and the only recourse is to mechanically disassemble the device, perform costly and laborious manual rework to remove and replace the corrupted flash ROM component, reassemble the device, and then perform testing to verify that the device is fully functional [see column 2, line 7-13]. The patent describes updating the contents of a first memory of a processor where new information intended for the first memory is received by the computer system from an external source, wherein the first memory is for storing information that is required during startup. The new information thus received is stored in a second memory capable of retaining information stored therein upon a restart. The system is restarted without relying on the new information. Thus the new information stored in the second memory can be verified to ensure that it is safe to load the new information into the first memory. When a positive verification result is obtained, the new information is loaded from the second memory into the first memory such that the new information can be used for a subsequent operation [see the abstract].

Application/Control Number: 10/647,135

Art Unit: 2838

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify Hull's apparatus and include Lemke's teachings in order to avoid costly,

Page 4

laborious, manual rework to remove and replace the corrupted flash ROM component of the "smart

battery".

As to claims 2-4, see remarks and references for claim 1 above.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The prior art cited in PTO-892 and not mentioned above disclose related apparatus.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should

be directed to Examiner Pia Tibbits whose telephone number is (571) 272-2086. If unavailable, contact

the Supervisory Patent Examiner Mike Sherry whose telephone number is (571) 272-2084. The

Technology Center Fax number is (703) 872-9306.

7. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application

Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from

either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at

866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PFT

May 12, 2005

Pia Tibbits

Primary Patent Examiner